



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,255	03/17/2004	Pim van Meurs	TEGI0012CIP	5958
22862	7590	06/27/2006	EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025			HAN, QI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/803,255

Applicant(s)

MEURS ET AL.

Examiner

Qi Han

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/11/06 & 6/7/06.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 04/11/2006 and 06/07/2006 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Response to Amendment

4. This communication is responsive to the applicant's preliminary amendment and RCE examination both filed on 04/11/2006. The Applicant(s) amended claims 1, 29 and 56, and cancelled claims 26 and 82 (see the amendment: pages 1-19).

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35, USC 112 1st, because the applicant amended the corresponding claims (the amendment: pages 2-3, 8 and 13-14).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to rejection under 35 USC 103 (a) have been fully considered. It is noted that even though applicant amended the claim, the previous provided references is still applicable to the amended claims (see detail below).

In response to applicant's arguments regarding rejection of claim 29, that “neither Chen nor Ni associate a single ideographic data set to a set of ideographic indices allowing a signal stored ideographic data set to be correlated via indices to both a stroke input method and a phonetic input” (the amendment: page 22, paragraph 3 to page 23 paragraph 2), by reviewing the amended claim limitations, applicant’s explanations and the prior art teachings, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant and has a different view of the prior art teachings and/or the claim interpretations. It is noted that either phonetic input (such as Pinyin method) or stroke input (such as Five-Stroke method) necessarily includes converting the key-in input into a set of internal codes or sequences (indexes) to map or to search the ideographic characters (such as Chinese characters—Hanzi), which is well known in the art. It is also well known in the art that an ideographic character is inherently associated with an internal code (or index) as an interface code for accessing the character from outside of ideographic database (or dataset), such as GB2312-80 form of Chinese character standard disclosed by Chen (col. 4, lines 15-18), wherein the interface code is shared by various kinds of input methods for access, including use of Pinyin method and Five-Stroke method. Therefore, when a system has capability of implementing phonetic input (such as Pinyin method) and stroke input (such as Five-Stroke method), the both

input methods necessarily or inherently share the interface code (index) for accessing the corresponding ideographic character (such as Hanzi).

For above reason, it is believed that the applicant's arguments are not persuasive, and the rejection is sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 27 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949).

In the present instance, claim 7 recites the broad recitation of “one of said plurality of inputs is associated with a special wildcard input that is associated with zero or one of said phonetic characters”, and the claim also recites “one of said plurality of inputs is associated with a special wildcard input that is associated with zero or one of said **strokes and phonetic characters** (inheriting from parent claim 1)”, which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Regarding claim 81, the claim is almost identical with claim 56. A cancellation or appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 9-45 and 47-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (6,073,146) in view of NI et al. (6,822,585 B1) hereinafter referenced as NI.

As per **claim 29**, Chen discloses system and method for processing Chinese language text (title), comprising:

“a user input device having a plurality of input means, each of said input means being associated with at least one of a plurality of strokes and a plurality of phonetic characters, an input sequence being generated each time when an input means is selected by said user into said user input device[, wherein said user selection of said input means is alternatively associated with at least one of said plurality of strokes and said plurality of phonetic characters]]” (column 4, lines 28-43, ‘entering phonetic Chinese (Pinyin and BPMF)’, ‘the system has a novel keyboard (input device that has multiple keys that interpreted as a plurality of input means) with diacritic keys’, ‘a process ...determines that a syllable (an input) has been entered (selected)

Art Unit: 2626

when a diacritic key is struck'; column 1, lines 33-60, 'Five-Stroke method' and 'phonetic input');

"an input method specific database containing a plurality of input sequences and, associated with each input sequence, at least one of a set of phonetic sequences whose spellings correspond to the input sequence and a set of stroke sequences corresponding to the input sequence" (column 4, lines 44-61, 'a dictionary of phonetic words (corresponding to an input method specific database)'; Fig. 3 and column 9, line 55 to column 10, line 49, 'a data structure 300 for the ASCII coding for Pinyin or mixed input (input sequences)'; Fig. 7 and column 11, line 62 to column 12, line 67, 'the Chinese syllable list 700 (including phonetic sequences)'; which can also be read on "input method specific database") ;

"an ideographic database associated with [[both]] phonetic input and stroke input]], said ideographic database containing a set of ideographic character sequences associated with a set of ideographic indices, wherein said set of ideographic indexes corresponding to [[both a plurality of stroke indices having corresponding stroke sequences and]] a plurality of phonetic indices having corresponding phonetic sequences" (column 4, lines 3-17, 'converting phonetic Chinese (Pinyin or BPMF) input (inherently includes indices which is related with the inputted phonetic sequences for mapping or searching ideographic character) character writing (Hanzi) (ideographic character)', and using 'square-character (Hanzi) stream in the GB2312-80 form' (corresponding to Hanzi database (ideographic database) that inherently includes a set of internal codes (indices), each associated with a Hanzi character); column 6, lines 20-32, 'displays the Pinyin characters 1020' and 'the Hanzi characters 1025', which is inherently accessed by the corresponding internal codes (indices); column 1, lines 38-53, 'Five-stroke methods' that

Art Unit: 2626

necessarily include associating with ideographic database in order to access ideographic character (such as Hanzi));

“means for comparing the input sequence with said input method specific database and finding at least one of stroke indices corresponding to matching stroke entries and phonetic indices corresponding to matching phonetic entries and said matching stroke entries or phonetic entries” (column 4, lines 44-49, ‘the word string (input sequence) is compared to a dictionary (input method specific database) of phonetic words’; column 11, lines 21-22, ‘matched string is used as a syllable input’; column 1, lines 39-45, ‘five-stroke method’);

“means for converting at least one of said matching stroke indices associated with said matching stroke entries; and said matching phonetic indices associated with matching phonetic entries to matching ideographic indices” (column 4, lines 3-17, ‘converting phonetic Chinese (Pinyin or BPMF) input to character writing (Hanzi) (ideographic character)’), wherein the dictionary and Hanzi database stated above necessarily include entries and indices);

“means for retrieving matching ideographic character sequences from said ideographic database by said matching ideographic indices; and an output device for displaying one or more matched stroke or phonetic entries, and matched ideographic characters” (column 6, lines 27-29, ‘the system...converts the Pinyin into Hanzi (ideographic character), and displays (including retrieval) the Hanzi characters on a second section of the graphical interface’).

But, Chen does not expressly disclose that the preferred system using ideographic character with “a plurality of stroke indices having corresponding stroke sequences”. However, the feature of using a stroke based input method (inherently including stroke indices) is well known in the art as evidenced by Chen himself, who discloses the well-known ‘Five-Stroke

Art Unit: 2626

methods' for inputting Chinese character (column 1, lines 38-53), which necessarily include indices (or internal codes) related to the inputted stroke sequences for mapping or searching ideographic character'. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chen's preferred embodiment by specifically providing the Five-Stroke method for inputting Chinese characters, as taught by Chen himself, for the purpose of offering both new and well-known input method/system for inputting Chinese characters.

Even through Chen discloses using stroke-based input method and phonetic input method (column 1, lines 33-61), Chen does not expressly discloses "user selection of said input means is alternatively associated with at least one of said plurality of strokes and said plurality of phonetic characters", the ideographic database associated with "**both**" phonetic input and stroke input, the ideographic indexes corresponding to "**both**" the stroke indices and the phonetic indices. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by NI who discloses 'input of symbols' (title) that 'includes any graphic glyph which can be inputted directly from a keyboard or a keypad' and 'the symbols include a alphabets, digits...character strokes and tone marks' (col. 4, lines 21-26), comprising 'inputting characters into a terminal... having a plurality of keys', 'a number of the keys have associated with them a alphabet of different symbols (alternatively associated) which can be accessed and indicated in a display by means of single or multiple key selections or key presses of the keys' (col. 4, lines 15-32), using 'Chinese input dictionary which contains a mapping table of Pinyin string (phonetic characters) and matching Chinese characters (corresponding to ideographic database)' (col. 6, lines 3-9), and that 'the invention significantly simplifies the input of Pinyin (phonetic input) ... with carefully designed

Art Unit: 2626

key mapping, this method can also improve other Chinese input methods ...such as Bopomofo or Wubizixin (stroke input)’ (col. 11, lines 18-23), which suggests that Chinese dictionary (ideographic database) is necessarily associated with both Pinyin and stroke inputs and capable of allowing user select one of input methods, as claimed. NI also teaches that ‘most of the existing Chinese input methods were original designed for PC keyboards’ and discloses the previous endeavor for a character input method that requires more basic input symbols than the number of keys on a keypad (col. 1, line 52 to col. 2, lines 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chen by providing input means with a plurality of keys that are associated with different symbols and using ideogram dictionary (database), such as Chinese input dictionary, alternatively associated with input in both Pinyin method and stroke method, as taught by NI, for the purpose (motivation) of improving character input method (NI: col. 11, lines 21-23).

As per **claim 30** (depending on claim 29), Chen further discloses “said stroke indices are indices of strokes stored by stroke sequences in a stroke input system” (column 1, lines 38-53, ‘a few key strokes—as a combination of theses elementary graphical components’, ‘Five-Stroke method’, which necessarily includes storing stroke sequences in the system).

As per **claim 31** (depending on claim 29), as stated above, Chen discloses “said stroke input system is 5-stroke or 8-stroke system” (column 1, lines 38-53).

As per **claim 32** (depending on claim 29), as stated above, Chen discloses “said phonetic indices are indices of phonetic characters sorted by actual spelling in a phonetic input system” (column 4, line 29, ‘Pinyin and BPMF’ read on the claim).

As per **claim 33** (depending on claim 32), as stated above, Chen discloses “said phonetic input system is a Pinyin system or a Zhuyin system” (column 4, line 29, ‘Pinyin and BPMF’).

As per **claim 34** (depending on claim 29), as stated above, Chen discloses “said phonetic indices are indices of input means in a phonetic input system” (column 4, line 29, ‘Pinyin and BPMF’ read on the claim).

As per **claim 35** (depending on claim 29), Chen further discloses “means for prioritizing stroke or phonetic sequences that match an input sequence and prioritizing ideographic character sequences that match a matching stroke or phonetic sequence according to a linguistic model” (column 12, lines 63-67, ‘the most probable syllable is displayed’ and ‘best matches...selected’ (interpreted as prioritizing); abstract, ‘using... a statistical language model (linguistic model)’).

As per **claim 36** (depending on claim 35), Chen further discloses “said linguistic model comprises at least one of: ... ; frequency of occurrence of ideographic character sequences, stroke sequences or phonetic sequences in formal or conversational written text; frequency of occurrence of ideographic character sequences, stroke sequences or phonetic sequences when following a preceding character or characters; ...” (column 18, lines 45-62, ‘statistics of the relative word occurrence in the phrase (reflecting frequency of occurrence)’, which reads on the claim).

As per **claim 37** (depending on claim 29), as stated above, Chen discloses “said phonetic sequences comprise single syllables” (column 4, lines 29-47, ‘phonetic input (sequences)’, ‘the word string’ and ‘Pinyin’, which necessarily includes single syllables; column 3, line 9, ‘single words (corresponding to single syllable phonetic sequences)’).

As per **claim 38** (depending on claim 29), as stated above, Chen discloses “said phonetic sequences comprise both single and multiple syllables” (column 4, lines 29-47, ‘phonetic input (sequences)’, ‘the word string’ and ‘Pinyin’, which necessarily includes both single and multiple syllables; column 3, lines 6-56, ‘single words (corresponding to single syllables)’, ‘multiple-syllables’).

As per **claim 39** (depending on claim 29), Chen further discloses “said phonetic sequences comprise user generated sequences” (column 6, lines 20-21, ‘user uses keyboard to enter (generate) Pinyin text input (sequences)’).

As per **claim 40** (depending on claim 39), Chen further discloses “in absence of matching phonetic sequences in said database, a sequence of matching phonetic sequences is automatically generated based on single and optionally multiple syllable phonetic sequences” (column 4, lines 51-61, ‘if the word string has no matches in the dictionary, a morphological analysis is done (automatically)...any standard affixes are removed from the word string, the remaining word string (root) (may be single syllable word) is re-analyzed’; column 3, lines 6-56, ‘single words (corresponding to single syllable phonetic sequences)’, ‘multiple-syllable words (phonetic sequences)’).

As per **claim 41** (depending on claim 40), Chen further discloses “said sequence of matching phonetic sequences is narrowed down through user interaction” (column 12, lines 63-67, ‘the user selects the proper syllable from the menu (narrowed down through user interaction)’).

As per **claim 42** (depending on claim 40), as stated above, Chen discloses “a sequence of matching ideographic character sequences is automatically generated based on matching

Art Unit: 2626

phonetic sequences to ideographic character sequences” (column 6, lines 27-29, ‘the system ... converts the Pinyin (phonetic sequences) into Hanzi (ideographic character)’).

As per **claim 43** (depending on claim 42), as stated above, Chen discloses “a sequence of matching ideographic character sequences is narrowed down through user interaction” (column 18, lines 55-60, ‘the result on the Hanzi 1024 portion (ideographic character sequences)...the remaining candidates are presented to the user ...for selection (narrowed down through user interaction)’), ‘1025 is subject to manual correction by the user’).

As per **claim 44** (depending on claim 35), Chen in view of NI further discloses “changing the associated priority of the matching phonetic sequence and the sequence of ideographic characters once an ideographic character sequence is selected”, (Ni: col. 3, lines 67, to col. 4, line 5, during input of text, a user is presented with a list of the Latin symbols in an order determined (changed) by the probability (associated priority) of being the next symbol rather than being in default, for example alphabetical order’, which suggests selection from the list may also changes the associated priority (order)’).

As per **claim 45** (depending on claim 29), Chen further discloses “the user can specify a particular tone for the phonetic syllable” (column 4, lines 33-4, ‘permit the user to annotate (specify) each entered phonetic test syllable with a diacritic that indicates the tone of the syllable’).

As per **claim 47** (depending on claim 29), Chen further discloses “the user can specify an explicit ideographic character separator” (column 10, line 60 to column 11, line 10, ‘the user enters a syllable through the keyboard...delimited by special delimiters, i.e. a space’).

As per **claim 48** (depending on claim 29), Chen in view of NI further discloses “the user is returned a sequence of phonetic sequences of exact matches and predictions that partially match” (Chen: column 6, lines 24, ‘displays (returns) the Pinyin characters 1023[1022]’; Ni: Fig. 5, blacks 25 (shows partially match) and 26; col. 3, lines 49, ‘predicts the next Chinese character according to the context and a Chinese word database’).

As per **claim 49** (depending on claim 48), Chen further discloses “the sequence is ordered according to the frequency of use based on a linguistic model” (column 18, lines 45-62, ‘statistics of the relative word occurrence in the phrase (interpreted as frequency of use)’, ‘the most probable (ordered) word of the remaining notional word candidates’, ‘statistical model’).

As per **claim 50** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 36, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 36.

As per **claim 51** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 43, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 43.

As per **claim 52** (depending on claim 51), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 49, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 49.

As per **claim 53** (depending on claim 52), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 36, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 36.

8. Claims 1-25, 27-28, 46 and 54-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of NI as applied to claims 29-53, and further in view of ZHANG et al. (5,197,810).

As per **claim 46** (depending on claim 29), Chen does not expressly disclose “one of said plurality of inputs is associated with a **special wildcard** input that is associated with any or all tones”. However, the feature of using a wildcard for inputting and displaying symbols/texts is well known in the art as evidenced by ZHANG who discloses method and system for inputting simplified forma and/or original complex form of Chinese character (title), comprising ‘Fuzzy auxiliary inputting method’ in which some special keys ‘can be used in substitution as a wild card’ or ‘can be used as the fuzzy key (wildcard key)’(col. 13, line 59 to col. 13, line 8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Chen by providing an input method with wild card used for substitution of input symbols or text, taught by ZHANG, for the purpose (motivation) of using the wild card in substitution of an input (ZHANG: col. 13, lines 62-63), such as input of Pinyin characters and/or strokes representing Chinese character components, as disclosed by Chen, NI and ZHANG in the background sections.

As per **claim 54** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 46.

As per **claim 55** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 46.

As per **claims 1**, it recites a method. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 29 and 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 29 and 46.

Art Unit: 2626

As per **claims 2-3, 28 and 5-23** (depending on claim 29), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 30-44, and 47-53 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 30-44, and 47-53 respectively.

As per **claim 4** (depending to claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 32, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 32.

As per **claim 24** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim.

As per **claim 25** (depending on claim 24), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 48, because the rejection for claim 48 covers the same or similar limitation(s) of this claim, wherein the input is a string of strokes used in stroke-based input method.

As per **claim 27** (depending on claim 1), as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (as state above), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 55, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 55.

As per **claim 56**, it recites a computer readable medium. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 29 and 46, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 29 and 46.

As per **claims 57-78** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 29-44 and 47-53 respectively, because the claims recite the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 29-44 and 47-53 respectively.

As per **claim 79** (depending on claim 56), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 24, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 24.

Art Unit: 2626

As per **claim 80** (depending on claim 79), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 25, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 25.

As per **claim 81** (depending on claim 56), as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd (as state above), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

Conclusion

9. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the

Art Unit: 2626

hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
June 22, 2006



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER